DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 410 SO 017 320

AUTHOR Leming, James S.
TITLE On the Normative Foundations of Economic Education.
PUB DATE 18 Apr 86
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Development; Cognitive Objectives; Concept Formation; Content Analysis; *Curriculum Development; Economics; *Economics Education; *Educational Attitudes; Educational Research; Epistemology; Relevance (Education); *Social Science Research; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Normative Philosophy

ABSTRACT

The organization and argument of this paper on the status of economic education in American schools today are essentially summarized in four observations. They are that: (1) the current emphasis of economic education is overwhelmingly cognitive and focuses on increasing student knowledge and understanding of our economic system; (2) available evidence on the impact of cognitively oriented approaches to economic education suggests that they have no educationally significant influence on students' economic related attitudes, values, norms, dispositions, etc.; (3) it is increasingly apparent that attitudes and dispositions related to economic life are of importance to personal economic success, system maintenance, and vitality; and (4) if the above observations are correct, then one may conclude that there is a gaping hole at the heart of economic education that needs concerned attention. The body of the paper develops these points, suggests four interpretations regarding the significance of attitude changes resulting from economics curricula, and proposes two goals of economic education, one personal and one social. The paper concludes by presenting perspectives for understanding the dynamics of normative economic socialization in schools and discusses their implications in regard to the importance of an attitudinal dimension in the planning of curricula. References are included. (TRS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED272410

# On the Normative Foundations of Economic Education

James S. Leming
Associate Professor
Curriculum, Instruction & Media
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JAMES S. LEMING

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 017 320

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 18, 1986.

# On the Normative Foundations of Economic Education

James S. Leming

Southern Illinois University

I wish to begin this paper with a series of observations regarding the current status of economic education in American schools today. These observations essentially summarize the organization and argument of this paper. The four observations are:

1. The current emphasis of economic education is overwhelmingly cognitive. The focus is on increasing student knowledge and understanding of our economic system.
2. Available evidence on the impact of cognitively oriented approaches to economic education suggests that they have no educationally significant influence on students' economic related attitudes, values, norms, dispositions, etc.
3. It is increasingly apparent that attitudes and dispositions related to economic life are of importance to personal economic success and system maintenance and vitality.
4. If the above observations are correct, then one may conclude that there is a gaping hole at the heart of economic education that needs concerned attention.

In the final sections of this paper I will attempt to present some perspectives for understanding the dynamics of normative socialization in schools and discuss the implications of these perspectives for a view of economic education that acknowledges the importance of an attitudinal dimension in the planning of curricula.

The cognitive emphasis of current economic education curricula.

The emphasis of any curricula may be judged from two sources: What the authors say the curricula is designed to achieve, and an analysis of the actual materials themselves. Two privately funded organizations have been leaders in the development of economic education curricula: The Joint Council on Economic Education and the Foundation for Teaching Economics. These two organizations have been strong voices for economic education and have been a major force in bringing economic education to schools. In the remainder of this section I will examine the curricular emphases of these two organizations.

Since 1949 the Joint Council on Economic Education has been a national leader in economic education curriculum development. The curriculum development of JCEE has been guided by A Framework for Teaching Economics (Hansen et al. 1977) and most recently A Framework for Teaching the Basic Concepts (Saunders et al., 1984). These frameworks were developed primarily by economists and their purpose is to guide curriculum planning for economic education so that all salient economic concepts are presented: ". . . to clarify which economic concepts should be taught and how to teach them most effectively . . ." (p. 2, 1984). While both documents emphasize economic understanding and decision making, there is little recognition of the importance of attitudinal goals, and no systematic attempts through curricula designed to foster strong affect toward our economic system. The approach of JCEE does recognize a set of broad social goals for evaluating economic actions and policies: economic freedom, efficiency, equity, security, full employment, price stablity, and economic growth. These goals are seen primarily as factors used in making reasoned economic decisions and it is recognized that self-interest may be attached a major weight by the

individual in his/her deliberations. The JCEE curriculum framework does not take as an important curricular task the strengthening of student commitment to a given social goal. The economic system and its underlying ethos is taken as a given, and the assumption is that developing an understanding of the economy and a reasoned approach to economic decision making will strengthen commitment to that system.

The Foundation for Teaching Economics and their junior high text book Our Economy takes a slightly different approach. It is openly recognized by Clawson (1984) that the curriculum has a strong affective thrust. Clawson argues that it is important that students develop values that are consistent with our democratic society. The affective goals of Our Economy are:

> respect the worth and dignity of the individual and respect the contributions they make to our way of life, develop, clarify, and act on a personal set of values consistent with our democratic society, develop the capacity to participate in social life both as an individual and as member of a group, and appreciate that our economy is controlled by individuals working individually and in concert.

Both curriculum efforts recognize the need for more than a cognitive/content oriented approach based on the structure of the discipline simplified for pedagogical purposes, yet both approaches assume that the development of affective allegiance to system norms is a given in economic education. Ingels and Utne O'Brien's (1985) comments regarding Our Economy are also an appropriate description curriculum efforts of the Joint Council:

> "Although the text sponsors hold a strong value position on economic issues, the text itself is designed to be a descriptive presentation and eschews specific value recommendations, instead asking students to be thoughtful about controversial issues. The text sponsors have, however, hoped that

increased economic knowledge and understanding would have the effect of enhancing appreciation of the sort of mixed market economy, in which private enterprise has a large role that prevails in the United States," (p. 13). Neither approach, in terms of curricula or activities, attempts to strengthen allegiance to our system. The assumption is that through teaching the content, understanding, and reasoning processes associated with our system commitment will in fact be fostered. Let us turn now to the empirical evidence available to support this alleged connection between cognitive and affective outcomes.

## The influence of current economic education programs on economic attitudes

Since the above approaches are designed to increase student knowledge and reasoning ability, should one also expect to see attitudinal changes as well? There are a number of recent sources of information on this topic. Jackstadt and Brennan (1983) report the results of an inquiry to assess whether a gain in knowledge will lead to a change in attitude with students that had taken a high school economics course. Three separate attitude scales constructed by the authors were used: attitudes toward the American economic system, toward business, and toward labor unions. Jackstadt and Brennan found economic learning predicted change in attitude toward all three attitude objects, with paths to attitudes toward the American economic system, business and labor unions of .171, .050, and .056, respectively. In other words, two percent of the variance in attitudes toward the economic system is explained by increased economic knowledge. Less than one percent of the variance in the other two attitude scales is explained by learned economic knowledge.

A number of studies with college age students have shown that courses in economics may affect students' economic attitudes. Illustrative of this

genre of studies is a recent inquiry by Jackstadt, Brennan and Thompson (1985). In this study student conservatism was measured by a 30-statement attitude survey developed by the authors that tapped four elements of the concept of economic conservatism: (1) preference for private rather than public ownership of resources; (2) belief that competition checks abuses of private power; (3) the belief that competition fosters efficiency and progress; and (4) a preference for decentralized market allocation of resources over centralized allocation. Using a five-point Likert scale it was possible for scores to range from 150, indicating an extremely conservative position, to 30, indicating an extremely non-conservative or liberal position. The mean pre- and post-test scores for 441 students taking a college introductory economics course were 3.052 (pre-test) and 3.197 (post-test). Change for the economics group was found to be significantly greater ($p < .001$) for economics students compared with students not enrolled in economics courses. The mean change (.145), it should be noted, represents a shift of three percent of the five-point scale's range.

Another recent study using college students (Walstad and Soper, 1983), measured the extent to which introductory economics students pre- and post-tested on the Economic Attitude Sophistication Scale held attitudes consistent with the current state of expert economic knowledge. The EAS scale contained items dealing with nine broad areas: government regulation, taxation, welfare, inflation, foreign trade, unemployment, incentives, power concentration and economic growth. This study also found statistically significant gain scores for the economics students; however, here also the magnitude of the change was small--three percent of the scale's range.

The most comprehensive effort to measure young peoples' attitudes and values with respect to economic issues has been developed by the National Opinion Research Center under sponsorship of the Foundation for Teaching Economics (Utne O'Brien and Ingels, 1984). The Economics Values Inventory (EVI) was developed as part of a larger project to evaluate the impact of the text Our Economy upon the economic values and attitudes of students. Using the Our Economy text and the JCEE Framework eight distinct scales were generated:

1. The Free Enterprise System--support for the free enterprise system.
2. Business--trust in business.
3. Psychological: Personal Economic Efficacy (alienation and powerlessness).
4. Government Role in Social Welfare (government is responsible for social welfare).
5. Government Role in Setting Prices (against government role).
6. Unions (against powerful unions).
7. Treatment of Workers (workers treatment is fair).
8. The Economic Status Quo (against the status quo because it is unfair).

The EVI consists of 44 items with student responses ranging from seven--which shows strong agreement, to one--strong disagreement with scale values. In the "text" versus "no text" conditions of the report, modest but statistically significantly differences are seen on scales 1, 2, 3, 7 and 8. The largest of these differences, however, was only .31 on the seven-point scale for Trust in Business (No. 2). This is a four percent difference on the sub-scale's range favoring the text condition.

It appears safe to conclude, based on the above research that economics instruction may result in small changes in the economic attitudes of students. This same pattern of findings is apparent in social studies research that has assessed political attitudes (Leming, 1985). In my judgment, the reported changes in economic attitudes must be viewed skeptically as there is no evidence regarding their stability. Also, one must question the educational significance of such miniscule changes. I will discuss these reservations below.

Interpreting the findings regarding changes in economic attitudes as a result of economic education curricula.

It appears to me that there are four potential interpretations regarding the question of the educational and social significance of the changes in attitudes found as a result of economics education curricula:

1. The trivial findings interpretation. The research findings suggest that the influence of economic education curricula on economic attitudes are trivial and completely without educational or social significance. This perspective holds that the magnitude of the changes are so small and ephemeral that no reasonable case can be made for continuing to claim that the investment of time and energy expended yields socially valuable results. Not only has it been shown that the changes are miniscule, but the research has also failed to demonstrate that these changes persist after the treatment ends. Also, no link between the paper and pencil data collected and real-world economic behavior has been established. Given these findings, the profession would best use its time and energy concentrating on what it does best, increasing student knowledge.

2. The resistant variables interpretation. It is granted that the changes detected in the research are small; however, given the nature of the variables, this is not unexpected. Behavioral science research has long found the areas of attitudes and values to be among the most resistant to change. With the well-established potent influence of the home and the somewhat less influential but pervasive influence of media and culture, it would appear unrealistic to expect schooling experiences to dramatically impact on economic attitudes. The fact that any positive influence is detected is encouraging and sufficient warrant for holding the intervention as effective.

3. The small but socially significant interpretation. This interpretation is built around the observation that sometimes the small changes found as a result of an intervention may have great social significance. The best example of this line of argument comes from the field of medical research. Gage's (1978) recent discussion of small effects in teaching effectiveness research makes this medical analogy. One study cited by Gage is the research reporting that through restriction in cholesterol and treatment with drugs the incidence of heart attack can be reduced. Although the above treatment produced only 1.7 percent reduction in heart attacks and accounted for only .1 percent of the variance in heart attacks, the study was widely cited as of profound significance for the practice of medicine. If we can argue that the changes found in social studies research are of equal social significance, then the research in the field takes on a much more salutary appearance.

4. The developmental interpretation. This interpretation assumes that economic attitudes and values are developmental in nature; that is, they proceed through an invariant progression of stages. From this perspective

one could positively interpret the small gains detected as a result of different interventions as making an essential contribution to the economic development of youth. The small increments observed are seen as essential steps toward a more mature and consistent form of belief and reasoning. Since development is invariant and progressive these small gains will not be lost, but rather are a small socially significant step toward a desirable goal of developmentally mature populace that possesses a sophisticated understanding of our economic system and a deep affective allegiance to its principles. The Kohlbergian research on moral reasoning provides a compatible framework for the interpretation spelled out above. To attempt to fit economic attitudes to this template is, however, as will be seen below, not an easy task.

Which of the above interpretations is the most plausible? The trivial findings interpretation is probably the most distasteful to economic education researchers (for it suggests the real estate sales may well be a more socially productive career), but it is a difficult notion to dispel. The critical information needed to reject this proposal is longitudinal; that is, if it can be shown that these incremental changes persist over time, or perhaps lay dormant for a period of time, but eventually have impact, or in some way accrete to that constellation of attributes we typically refer to as economically mature citizens, then there exists non-trivial social value in the enterprise of economic education.

The resistant variables interpretation seems warranted. Attitudes are difficult to change and when one compares the school and its potential influence with that of the family, peers, and the cultural milieu, one must be conservative about what can reasonably be expected from social studies instruction in this regard. This interpretation, however, while making us

less idealistic about what can be accomplished, does not establish any grounds for saying that the small influence of social studies education on student attitudes has social value, for the same possibility of emphemeral changes as discussed under the trivial interpretation persists.

The small but socially significant (medical analogy) interpretation is an engaging one, but unfortunately such a critical and significant outcome as preserving human life simply does not exist in economic education research. While few will argue that development of commitment to a capitalistic mixed market economy principles and economic skills are not highly significant social outcomes, difficulty exists in showing that the economics education contributes in any meaningful and lasting way to that development. It is much like an M.D. trying to argue for the effectiveness of a given treatment by only reporting that immediately after the patient left the office he/she reported feeling slightly better.

Finally, the developmental interpretation is at least partially encouraging. By now, from my perspective, one can say with confidence that in school settings it is possible to facilitate the development of moral reasoning. A variety of research studies have also shown that reasoning about political issues follows hand in hand with development in moral reasoning. Kohlberg has also shown that his highest stage of moral reasoning (stage five) embodies the morality of the U.S. Constitution, and to fully understand our constitution requires the highest attainable stage. Therefore, since the small changes noted in dilemma discussion classrooms appear irreversible and provide the foundation for subsequent growth, and since they lead to a fuller understanding and appreciation of our democratic constitutional system of government, one can establish some social value for the achievement of these outcomes. However, this reasoning is cognitive in

nature, and still remaining is the unanswered question concerning the relationship between reasoning, attitudes, and social/political behavior or whether there is a parallel structure in normative economic reasoning.

With regard to economic attitudes, it seems obvious that one cannot talk about them in any strict developmental sense. It cannot be said that there exists an invariant, progressive sequence of economic attitudes toward some developmental end point, for it makes perfect sense, for example, to talk about loosing economic trust. In addition, historical factors such as major economic events such as depressions or scandals clearly have the potential to significantly influence such attitudes as trust in business or the economic system. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to attempt a developmental perspective on the affective and behavioral dimensions of citizenship, the area is one in need of analytic and empirical exploration. I now wish to turn to an analysis of why attitudes are so important to economic education and why current conceptualizations of the field are too limited.

The significance of the normative dimension to economic education.

Up until this point I have been analyzing in general the influence of economic education on attitudes as defined within existing research. I now would like to expand this concept of attitude more broadly by discussing the term "norms" and its relationship to economic education. First, let me present what I see as two essential goals of any approach to economic education:

1. Personal goal: to develop in individuals the knowledge, understanding, skills, and attitudes/dispositions that allow him/her to participate with success in our mixed market economy.

2. Social goal: to develop in the populace at large an understanding of, and commitment to, our economic system so as to ensure economic and societal vitality, cohesion, and stability.

Both of these goals can be defended based on the ideal of human dignity. The first on the grounds that it enhances human dignity by permitting every individual to develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to fulfill his/her economic potential and achieve economic security. The second goal can be defended on the grounds that its achievement is essential to the maintenance of a stable democratic society whose environment permits the maximum opportunity for self realization and therefore the enhancement of human dignity. Clearly, any social system survives only to the extent that maturing members of that society absorb and become attached to the superordinate goals of the system and come to accept its structure as legitimate.

Central to the above two goals for economic education is the concept of norms: standards for behavior; principles, premises or expectations regarding how individuals or a social system ought to operate. For example, with the personal goal for economic education some of the norms entailed are delayed gratification, industriousness, self-discipline and the like. The norms embedded in the social goal are freedom, equality of opportunity (not results), that collective well-being is insured as a result of individual pursuit of self-improvement, and the like. I will say more regarding the specifics of this normative content later. Norms, as defined above, have three components: cognitive content or knowledge regarding the nature of the norm; affective salience or the degree of attractiveness of the norm for the individual; and behavior, that is, behaviors entailed by and consistent with the norm.

One point that needs to be made at this time is that when I talk about the normative content of economic education I am not technically rediscovering that

sub-field of economics called normative economics. Normative economics is that branch of economics that is concerned with the effort to determine if there is some best economic arrangement or system. It is the position of the author that there is clearly a best arrangement and that arrangement is the current one in the United States. It is beyond the scope of the present paper to defend this position; however, the reader is referred to such authors as Novak (1982) and Gilder (1981) for penetrating analysis of this issue.

Currently, there is concern being expressed regarding whether youth in today's society are acquiring the necessary economic norms. One of the major conclusions on a report commissioned by the National Chamber Foundation (Etzioni, 1984) is that self discipline--the ability to control impulse, mobilize ego and commit to and sustain work ethic--is not being adequately developed in today's youth. This failure is manifest in what many employers today call the "lottery syndrome." That is, the belief among workers that there is an easy, quick way to wealth in this society. The popularity of such T.V. get-rich-quick hucksters as Ed Beckley Charles Givens, and Dave Del Dotto is further evidence of the pervasiveness of this syndrome.

Another report, Investing in Our Children by the Committee for Economic Development (1985), quotes a survey where employers report that for entry level positions they are looking for young people who demonstrate a set of attitudes, abilities and behaviors associated with a sense of responsibility, self discipline, pride, teamwork and enthusiasm. Clearly, there are a set of personal norms related to worker characteristics that are essential for personal success and also for the success of business. The development of these characteristics in youth has great importance for the future of the system as well as for the well-being of the individual. This is clearly an issue that needs to be addressed in economic education.

To an equal extent the emerging adult must also come to accept the legitimacy of current system of capitalism; that is, they must accept its normative structure. If, for example, the value of equality, which has strong appeal in our society, were to become a governing principle regarding the distribution of wealth in our economic system, a serious blow would have been struck to our economic system. Individuals must have a commitment to a particular hierarchy of economic norms, else the system stands endangered. It must become a part of the task of economic education to recognize and plan carefully for developing these norms in youth.

Non-curricular sources of economic socialization and values

How can the schools best accomplish the normative tasks of economic education? It is the position of this author that, to the extent that schools currently address these questions, it does so through the non-formal, non-curricular dimensions of schooling. In other words, what children learn in schools, especially as it relates to the socialization of norms and dispositions derives as much from the nature of the experience and the structure of schooling as it does from the formal process of instruction and the curriculum. This hidden curriculum serves as the primary mechanism for communicating normative and dispositional meanings to children. These meanings in effect become the constitutive rules for adult life. In the remainder of this section I wish to present the perspectives of three authors on the dynamics of this process schools. While none of the four authors present an exhaustive analysis of the influence of the latent curriculum on the economic socialization on youth, the combined perspectives convey the nature of the phenomena under question.

Bruno Bettleheim (1970) provides an insightful analysis into the development of a personal disposition essential for success in our society--middle class morality. Bettleheim defines middle class morality as ". . . the conviction that to postpone immediate pleasure in order to gain more lasting satisfactions in the future is the most effective way to reach one's goals," (p. 88). From his psychoanalytic perspective the task of education is to assess the degree to which the child possesses the reality principle and if it is not found to be sufficiently developed, educational efforts must be geared to helping him/her come to accept it as his own. The ability to postpone immediate pleasure must be based on the repeated experience that it pays off in the future. Bettleheim's argument takes on special significance with regard to disadvantaged students whose home, peer, and community values are based on the pleasure principle. In order to inculcate middle class morality in youth who lack it requires that we recognize the cultural background of the child and begin to, where possible, offer tangible advantages here and now for demonstrating middle class behaviors. What is important is that to get the child to do this is not largely a curricular matter (three "R's"), but rather a classroom and school structure matter.

A second perspective on the role of the schools in the sociological analyses of Talcott Parsons (1959) and Robert Dreeben (1968). Because of the similarity of views I will only discuss the perspective of Dreeben here. Central to the analysis of Dreeben is the observation that schools perform a socializing function that the family structure cannot; that is, the structural properties of the family, while satisfying specific affective needs of the child cannot adequately socialize them to function in the adult world. Schooling demands of the child the formation of social relationships that are more time bounded, more diverse, less dependent, and less emotive than those

of the family. The four norms that students learn in schools are:

1. Independence--pupils learn to acknowledge that there are tasks to be done by them alone and to do them that way, and that others have a right to expect such independent behavior under certain circumstances. The cluster of meanings associated with this norm include: doing things on one's own, being self-reliant, accepting personal responsibility for one's behavior and acting self-sufficiently.

2. Achievement--pupils come to accept the premise that they should perform their tasks the best they can and act accordingly. The cluster of meanings associated with this norm include mastery, making an impact on the environment rather than fatalistically accepting it, and competing against some standard of excellence.

3. Universalism--pupils come to accept being treated by others as members of categories. Schools perform a function the family cannot--the systematic establishment and destruction of membership categories (e.g., age-grade categories, ability level categories).

4. Specificity--pupils come to accept, and to confine one's interest in others, to being treated based on a narrow range of characteristics. Implicit in specificity is the notion of relevance--that is, the content of interest varies according to the needs and interests of others or the situation.

From the perspective of Dreeben, students learn far more than the cognitive skills essential to participate in our economy and society. They also learn expectations and norms that will produce good workers.

It should be pointed out, however, that socialization in schools is not uniform across all social and economic classes in society. As Wilcox (1982) and Anyon (1980) have shown differential socialization patterns exist between differing socio-economic schools. Middle class schools transmit values

necessary for successful middle class life such as internal motivation, anticipation of future success and skills in self-presentation. Working class students, on the other hand, are taught to rely on others for motivation, to focus on the here and now, and no skills at self-presentation.

The final perspective, to be discussed on the socialization of economic related values in schools is found in the work of Phillip Jackson (1968). According to Jackson, the nature of the hidden curriculum is shaped by three concepts: crowds, praise, and power. These dimensions--as members of crowds, as potential recipients of praise or reproof, and as pawns of authority--confront children with aspects of social reality not found elsewhere during their childhood years. Through living in crowds students have to learn that constantly they must conserve resources--they learn to postpone or give up desires. The unquestioned source of praise or reproof is the teacher and the student comes to uncritically and positively accept the hierarchically organized structures present in schools and learns that conformity to institutional expectations will lead to praise. Thus, the hidden curriculum develops essential norms and dispositions necessary for participation in a complex social and economic organizations.

Bettleheim has shown that the "middle class morality" essential for adult life is not taught through the curriculum, but rather through the structure of the classroom and school and the teacher-student interactions herein. The perspectives of Dreeben and Jackson on the socializing function of schools has succinctly captured by Arnowitz (1973):

> Indeed, the child learns in school. . . . The child learns that the teacher is the authoritative person in the classroom, but that she is subordinate to a principal. Thus the structure of society can be learned through understanding the hierarchy of power within the structure of the school. Similarly, the working-class child learns its role in society. On the one side, school impresses students as a whole with their powerlessness since they are without the knowledge required to become citizens and workers. On the other, the hierarchy of occupations and classes is reproduced by the hierarchy of grade levels and tracks within grades. Promotion to successive grades is the reward for having mastered the approved political and social behavior as well as the prescribed "cognitive" material. But within grades, particularly in large urban schools, further distinctions among students are made on the basis of imputed intelligence and that in turn is determined by the probable ability of children to succeed in terms of standards set by the educational system (p. 75).

Implications of a normative emphasis for economic education

If I have made the case up to this point that economic education has failed to adequately incorporate a concern for norms and dispositions, then a natural question to follow-up with is what should be done about this state of

affairs? One reaction that shouldn't be ruled out is a simple one: nothing. This response is not unreasonable and rests on two observations: (1) it is extremely difficult to change attitudes norms or dispositions and any efforts, no matter how well conceived, are likely to yield only minute incremental changes; (2) time attempting such changes will inevitably take away time from teaching content, a task at which the profession does very well. Economic education should focus on what it does best, teach content, and leave to other socializing agents the development of norms and dispositions. Clearly, the family, media, peers, role models, and early economic experiences will, when all is said and done, be the factors that have the lasting impact on attitudes.

While I find the above argument attractive, there is a compelling reason to accept it as only a partial answer. In my judgment, the stakes are too great for the economics education profession to relinquish concern regarding affective outcomes in economic education. If individuals are entering into the economic system in pursuit of individual economic well-being attitudinally at risk, and if pressures are constantly being applied to the ethos of democratic capitalism by those interested in insuring individual well-being at the cost of weakening the ethos of the economic system, then there exists compelling personal and social reasons for addressing attitudinal outcomes as an important concern for economic education.

The first two steps to be taken to respond to this challenge are to determine what the proper attitudinal goals for economic education should be and where we are at the present time relative to these goals. That is, what is the gap between the ideal and the real. I have attempted to spell out above some of the personal and social attitudinal goals for economic education. It should be pointed out, however, that such sources as the National Chamber Foundation Report (Etzioni, 1984) and the Economics Values Inventory (Utne

O'Brien and Ingles, 1984) represent only partial approximations of what should be a comprehensive view of these areas. There is a need, before any serious curriculum work begins, to develop a comprehensive statement regarding the normative basis for economic education. In my judgment, there is a need for a special commission to be convened to analyze the attitudinal necessities for agents in our economy as well as the requisite attitudinal foundations essential for the maintenance of the ethos of democratic capitalism. (Should anyone be willing to provide $100,000, I would be happy to begin this effort tomorrow.) Once these normative goals have been determined, it will be necessary to develop reliable and valid measures for assessing where we are now with regard to achieving these goals. In addition, it will be necessary to analyze curricular and non-curricular forces in school for opportunities to develop or change attitudes in students. If it is determined that in a selected normative area that the economic attitudes of youth are not acceptable, then some strategy for changing those attitudes must be implemented. At this point, the economic education profession will need to delve into principles underlying social psychology to generate curriculum that theoretically and empirically may result in desired changes in youths' attitudes. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to present the available literature on attitude development and change (Insko, 1967), it provides a base for beginning to think about appropriate strategies. Another possible fruitful approach involves the use of role models (Rushton, 1976). Clearly, realistic economic success stories in our society has great potential utility if used appropriately.

One inevitable by-product of such a curricular effort will be a heightened awareness of the importance of developmental differences among youth and of the necessity to develop developmentally appropriate curricula. Every economic attitude has affective and cognitive components. In the early years, one goal

will surely be the development of positive feelings associated with the narrative aspects of the economy. Later, after this non-rational foundation is firmly established, then the goal should shift toward, to use a phase introduced by Emile Durkheim, the development of "enlightened allegiance." That is, to add to the affective base, the cognitive content necessary to support the position consistent with a mature understanding of the economic, social, and political system.

While I am somewhat skeptical regarding education's potential for making a dramatic impact on attitudinal variables, clearly more can be done than is currently the case. I think it is also important to point out that one of the most energenic and emerging fields of scholarship in the social foundations of education presents a view of society and education that stands in stark contrast with the normative foundations of our economic system. This view of education has gone by such names as radical critiques of social education, critical theory, and neo-marxism. The views of such authors as Apple (1979) and Giroux (1983), and many others suggest that current economic and political arrangements are inherently unjust, and involve illegitimate class domination. They argue for a more equal society, one which has a decidedly socialist flavor with greater control over the economy by the people to achieve a more "fair" distribution of wealth and power. The educational prescription of these scholars is to develop in youth a radical consciousness regarding covert social and economic arrangements. While this school of thought has great intellectual power, they have been practically impotent due to an inability to transform their ideals into sound curricular practice. Those who support our current economic system should not take this movement lightly. If economic education is to meet the challenge of preparing youth for participation in the world's greatest economy, then, if my analysis is correct, new emphases are required.

REFERENCES


Anyon, J. (1980) Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. Journal of Education, 162, 67-92.

Apple, M.W. (1979) Ideology and Curriculum. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Aronowitz, S. (1973) False promises: The shaping of the American working class. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bettleheim, B. (1970) Moral education. In N.F. Sizer and T.F. Sizer (Eds) Moral education: five lectures (pp. 85-107). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Committee for Econmomic Development (1985). Investing in our children. New York: Committee for Economic Development.

Clauson, E.U. (1984) Our Economy: How It Works. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Dreeben, R. (1968) On What is Learned in School. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Etizioni, A. (1984) Self-discipline, schools, and the business community. Washington, DC: National Chamber Foundation.

Gage, N.L. (1978) The yield of research on teaching, Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 229-235.

Gilder, G. (1981) Wealth and poverty. New York: Bantam Books.

Giroux, H.A. (1983) Theory and Resistance in Education. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Hansen, W.L., Bach, G.L., Calderwood, J.D., and Saunders, P. (1977) A Framework for Teaching Economics: Basic Concepts. New York: Joint Council on Economic Education.

Ingels, S.J. and Utne O'Brien, M. (1985, May) Factors associated with changes in youths' attitudes towards economic issues. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, McAfee, NJ.

Insko, C.A. (1967) Theories of Attitude Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts.

Jackson, P. (1968) Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Jackstadt, S.L. and J.M. Brennan. (1983) Economic knowledge and high school student attitudes toward the American economic system, business, and labor unions. Theory and Research in Social Education, 11(3), 1-15.

Jackstadt, S.L., Brennan, J. and Thompson, S. (1985) The effect of introductory economics courses in college students' conservatism. Journal of Economic Education, 16(1), 37-51.

Leming, J.S. (1985) Research on social studies curriculum and instruction: Interventions and outcomes in the socio-moral domain. In. W.B. Stanley, Review of Research in Social Studies Education (pp. 123-213). Boulder, CO and Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse for the Social Studies, National Council for the Social Studies and the Social Science Education Consortium.

Novak, M. (1982) The spirit of democratic capitalism. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Parsons, T. (1959) The school class as a social system: Some of its functions in American society. Harvard Educational Review, 29(4), 297-318.

Rushton, J.P. (1976) Socialization and the altruistic behavior of children. Psychological Bulletin, 83, 898-913.

Saunders, P., Bach, G.L., Calderwood, J.D., and Hansen, W.L. (1984) A Framework for Teaching the Basic Concepts. New York: Joint Council on Economic Education.

Utne O'Brien, M. and Ingles, S.J. (1984) Foundation for Teaching Economics Report: The development of the economics values inventory. Chicago University of Chicago, National Opinion Research Center.

Walstad, W.B. and Soper, J.C. (1983) Measuring economic attitudes in high school. Theory and Research in Social Education, 11(1), 41-54.

Wilcox, K. (1982) Differential socialization in the classroom: Implications for equal opportunity. In. G. Spindler (Ed.), Doing the Ethnology of Schooling: Educational Antropology in Action. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

IBM/040386